

Koocanusa GA Meeting in Eureka, MT
Public Comments
June 5, 2003

Topic	Number of Sticker Dots	Comments from Meetings in June 2003
Access/Rec	11	Educational process for trail use
Other Issues	7	Important to maintain socio-economic base of resource dependent communities
Other Issues	5	Send invitations to local officials, public interest groups, academic institutions, (within the zone) to form collaboration groups to work with the Forest Service throughout the planning process on all issues. Public needs to understand the process, data, analysis, etc
Wildlife	5	Concern that T&E/Griz road standard limits will automatically limit recreation access "by law," that is recovery standards we must follow.
Access/Rec	4	Local managers need flexibility to prescribe treatments for specific areas – one size does not fit all
IRA/Wild	4	Limit OHV use within Roadless Areas
Other Issues	4	Sharing with the public data, analysis, science that will be used to do the affects by alternatives
Access/Rec	3	Policy statement in FP should state the forest is open for all uses, unless specifically
Access/Rec	3	Set up designated areas for specific use, i.e. OHV's vs. Horse/Mountain Bike/Foot/Hiking
Fire Risk	3	What data are you going to use to show the public what the fire risk is and where?
Fire Risk	3	Use slash, dead and down fuels as alternative energy sources to produce forest products. This will be a return on investment.
IRA/Wild	3	Open Roadless areas to motorized vehicles (50/50)
Timber	3	Need to use the best available science when developing prescriptions, not public opinion
Vegetation	3	Weed propagation destroying wildlife habitat
Water/Fish	3	Prescribe management on a watershed scale that utilizes a "Pulse" type disturbance rather than a "Press" system
Water/Fish	3	Which water quality standards will be used to determine future management actions?
Access/Rec	2	Provide additional motorized ATV's access (seasonal) – play areas above full pool – part roads and trails (single track) loops
Access/Rec	2	Need additional trail/areas for mountain biking and cross country skiing – connected areas/loops, excludes motorized (i.e. snowmobiles)
Access/Rec	2	Increased effort in providing scenic vistas across the G.A.
Access/Rec	2	Design plans to allow local managers to be more flexible and site specific
Access/Rec	2	Resolve conflict between OHV users and non-motorized uses within Tobacco River Rails-
Access/Rec	2	Provide/ensure aging population has adequate access across Forest for all recreational activities, i.e. huckleberry picking/ fishing, etc
Fire Risk	2	In using fire management, what emphasis (weight) is being given to the smoke pollution that necessarily occurs? Suggest more thought and concern be given to this problem
Fire Risk	2	More aggressive fuel reduction throughout the area
Fire Risk	2	Address the fuel build-up in the new plan
IRA/Wild	2	Protect heritage/customs and culture – talking about access to Forest – concern about additional road obliteration – NO MORE

The numbers in the above table simply indicate the level of interest in the topics identified by the meeting participants.

Koocanusa GA Meeting in Eureka, MT
Public Comments
June 5, 2003

Topic	Number of Sticker Dots	Comments from Meetings in June 2003
IRA/Wild	2	Hidden cost to Roadless areas need to be considered – i.e. loss of watersheds/wildlife – results of catastrophic fire from lack of management
Other Issues	2	Why do the Idaho Forests have greater latitude in meeting T&E laws?
Timber	2	Need more effective monitoring to determine the effectiveness of the tools being used to determine where and when and how timber sales are laid out
Timber	2	Is there a way to disperse the timber harvesting so that individual drainages are not over cut
Timber	2	Legal action needs to be take against destructionists groups shutting down salvage and
Timber	2	Is there a way to create incentives and/or appropriations to encourage stewardship
Water/Fish	2	Need to build inventory of streams that are open to mining, panning, dredging, etc. There should be at least as many open to above as closed. These streams must contain mineral values.
Wildlife	2	Would like to see the resource and financial hidden cost of non-management addressed (that is, non-managed lands will eventually be managed by fire; resource values like wildlife/fish habitat will be lost) (the things we are trying to save like wildlife species and diversity management will be lost)
Wildlife	2	Would like to see wildlife management standards more specific to GA
Access/Rec	1	Proposed wilderness managed differently in the two states
Access/Rec	1	Enhance driving for pleasure - #1 Recreational use of Forest
Access/Rec	1	Implications of road decommissioning on management of vegetative resource
Access/Rec	1	The larger population centers associated with the Idaho panhandle NF may overwhelm the influence and input from the smaller communities in the Kootenai NF
Access/Rec	1	Politics – large communities carry more “clout.”
Access/Rec	1	Provide/maintain mineralize access to KNF (fear)
Access/Rec	1	Designate roads and trails that are open to all types
Access/Rec	1	Senior citizens firewood program on closed roads
Fire Risk	1	Use in place inventories of vegetation classified into fire classes to show the public where and how serious the risk is
Fire Risk	1	Have the public help set up possible treatments to evaluate how the worst fire effects can be avoided
Fire Risk	1	What analysis methods are you going to use to evaluate alternative strategies, treatment types and locations?
Fire Risk	1	Are you going to use fire models?
Fire Risk	1	Use fire models with the field maps “gauge” worst-case scenario fires for the various areas
Fire Risk	1	Wildland Urban Interface more aggressive fuel management in the new plan
Fire Risk	1	More salvage to reduce wildfire
IRA/Wild	1	Movement towards “designation” of Big Creek and scenic river (complete study)
IRA/Wild	1	Maintaining access to National Forest within Inventoried Roadless
IRA/Wild	1	Close additional roads to add/encourage wildlife habitat and add to Roadless Areas
Other Issues	1	Will need two separate sets of alternatives for the two forests.
Other Issues	1	Idaho managed as wilderness, Montana managed as potential wilderness ie. allows

The numbers in the above table simply indicate the level of interest in the topics identified by the meeting participants.

Koocanusa GA Meeting in Eureka, MT
Public Comments
June 5, 2003

Topic	Number of Sticker Dots	Comments from Meetings in June 2003
Other Issues	1	GA concept is compartmentalized and not integrated.
Other Issues	1	Allow state to be directly authorized in this plan to have direct implementation involvement
Other Issues	1	Need to display quantities that will translate to management actions
Other Issues	1	What analyses will be applied and what outputs will be displayed in DEIS to evaluate
Other Issues	1	Respond to emails that we have received them.
Other Issues	1	#1 Priority of the forest should be to benefit the human environment (needs and culture).
Timber	1	There needs to be outputs specified in the plan
Timber	1	Would like to see management of timber resources by watershed basis
Timber	1	Whatever outputs are determined in the forest plan should be obtained
Timber	1	Forest Plan should contain an aggressive selective thinning program to pre-empt and solve moderate to high fire risk stands in order to keep watersheds from receiving ashen erosion.
Timber	1	Need to use local forest surveys/stand exams to determine outputs. Not public opinion
Timber	1	To allow 9'3" firewood/deadwood to be removed by general public
Timber	1	Maintain public input on burned areas and salvage
Timber	1	Harvest should meet/equal the mortality rate on forest
Timber	1	Need to avoid listing outputs by CCF or MBF and gear it toward improving forest health
Timber	1	Sustainability is key to forest health and also the key to community health. Community health is also an issue.
Timber	1	Need to provide for program to respond to public requests for small sales that may be covered under a Blanket approval similar to an HCP (state) process
Vegetation	1	Less management in designated old growth
Vegetation	1	Need to utilize "Best Science" for vegetation management – Not public opinion
Vegetation	1	Increased effort in thinning along reservoir corridor for scenic vistas as well as forest
Vegetation	1	Sediment issues related to road decommissioning needs to be quantified
Water/Fish	1	We need science-based standards to guide future management actions
Water/Fish	1	Questions on watershed screens
Wildlife	1	Would like to see connection made with management of T&E or general species and Roadless wilderness areas.
Wildlife	1	Would like to see wildlife management a lower priority because of non science-based court decisions that give wildlife a higher priority that is not based on sound science.

The numbers in the above table simply indicate the level of interest in the topics identified by the meeting participants.